Storm Water Construction General Permit Inspection Report

RWQCB - Region 5S

WDID # 5S03C337319 County: Amador

Del Rapini Const Inc
Owner's Name

Pine Grove Bluffs
Name of Development

28555 Rollins Lake Rd
Owner's Street Address

Developer Contact and Phone N(#

Colfax, CA 95713
Owner's City, State and Zip code

Ridge Road & Hwy 88
Site Address

Del Rapini 530-389-8002
Owner's contact person and phone #

Pine Grove, CA 95665
Site City, State, and Zip Code

Rich Muhl
Inspection Conducted By

2/22/2009
Date of Inspection

Samples taken 8:35 AM
Time of Inspection

Dry ___ **Hot** ___ **Clear** ___ **Overcast** X **Cold** ___ **Raining** X
Weather Conditions During Inspection (circle all that apply)

Status of Construction

Type of Inspection:

	Inspection in Conjunction with Other Permit
	Termination Request
X	Compliance Inspection
	Outreach Inspection
	Discharger/Facility Request
	Follow-up to previous inspection ** Date of Previous Inspection
	Other

Permit Type: Construction

	Yes	No
Storm Water Samples Collected?	X	
Non-Storm Water Discharge or Evidence of Non-Storm Water Discharge Observed?		X
Separate Inspection Report Written?		X
Updated SWPPP on Site?	X	

Control Measures Checklist:

Yes - Evident on inspection *No - Non evident on inspection*

Areas of Concern:	Yes	No
Evidence of erosion?	X	
(hills, gullies, slips)		
Dirt/sediment tracked in streets?		X
Evidence of dewatering?		X

Other

The SWPPP was not reviewed

Inspection Summary (complete only if no separate inspection report is written):

During the site inspection staff observed significant storm water management problems on the construction site. The inspection was conducted just after a significant rain event and light rain was still falling on the construction site. The entire site was walked and staff observed no significant improvement to the BMPs since the last site inspection. The still lacked an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs. Staff also observed a turbid storm water discharge from both outfall areas. The western outfall location was sampled using a field turbidity meter and the turbidity was 520 NTUs. Jackson Creek was also sampled upstream of the construction site using a field turbidity meter and the turbidity level was 18.1 NTUs (see inspection photographs).

Signature

Inspection ID: 1639400

Date Entered: 3/20/2009
Entered By: JC
Senior Review: SVM

Figure 1: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 2: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 3: Storm water from the site flowing in a channel adjacent to highway 88 right-of-way

Figure 4: Turbid storm water discharging into the eastern culvert

Figure 5: Another view of turbid storm water discharging into the eastern culvert which flows into Jackson Creek

Figure 6: Looking at the western discharge location in the distance

Figure 7: Storm water in the Caltrans right-of-way flowing to the western discharge location

Figure 8: Turbid storm water flowing down to the western discharge location

Figure 9: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs on the slope adjacent to Highway 88

Figure 10: Lack of effective BMPs upslope of the western discharge location Note: the large rill that is forming at the top of the slope

Figure 11: Lack of effective BMPs on top of the slope above the western discharge location

Figure 12: Area where concrete drain along the slope discharges into the area that flows down to the western discharge location Note: the lack of BMPs other than rip-rap

Figure 13: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 14: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 15: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 16: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs Note: the poorly stabilized stockpile

Figure 17: Turbid storm water in the concrete channel that runs along the slope on the northern side of the project

Figure 18: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 19: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 20: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 21: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs Note: the turbid storm water ponded adjacent to one of the discharge locations

Figure 22: Turbid storm water flowing on the site Note: the lack of effective storm water management BMPs

Figure 23: Turbid storm water ponded onsite just prior to discharge into the eastern culvert

Figure 24: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 25: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs Note: the only BMPs observed were a few small fiber rolls

Figure 26: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs around one of the discharge locations

Figure 27: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 28: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 29: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 30: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 31: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 32: Lack of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control BMPs

Figure 33: Turbid storm water discharging from the project

Figure 34: Turbid storm water from the site flowing into Jackson Creek

Figure 35: Turbid storm water from the site mixing with clean storm water in Jackson Creek

Figure 36: Turbid storm water from the site mixing with clean storm water in Jackson Creek